

REMARKS

In a non-final office action mailed January 5, 2009, all pending claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, and 18 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 8, 17, and 18. As such, claims 1-6, 8-15, 17 and 18 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

The Office Action entered a new rejection that claims 1-6 are rejected as allegedly being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection and in order to advance prosecution on the merits, Applicants have amended claim 1 as suggested in the Office Action. As such, Applicants request that the rejection under Section 101 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

All pending claims 1-6, 8-15, 17 and 18 stand rejected as obvious. In particular, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, and 18 (which includes all of the independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 18) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the combined teachings of four different references, namely, U.S. Patent 6,466,663 to Ravenscroft et al. ("Ravenscroft") in view of U.S. Patent 7,046,789 to Anderson et al. ("Anderson"), further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0184593 to Elsey et al. ("Elsey"), further in view of U.S. Patent 6,563,920 to Flockhart ("Flockhart"). The remaining dependent claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the four references under which the corresponding base claims have been rejected, further in view of additional references, namely, U.S. Patent 6,587,556 to Judkins et al. ("Judkins") for claims 4 and 13, U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0137536 to Hugh ("Hugh") for claims 6 and 15, and U.S. Patent 6,526,397 to Chee et al. ("Chee") for claims 10-12.

Applicants have amended each of the pending independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 to define more particularly the subject matter sought to be patented. The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments appear in the specification as originally filed, for example

particularly at 14, lines 6-15, and further and more generally in Figures 7, 8, 11A and 11B and the corresponding description of these figures.

Applicants' amended claims are patentable over the cited references because the references, either separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed graphical user interface of claim 1 comprising an overview area and a detailed area, wherein the overview area displays "multiple different customer queues to which at least one of the selected interaction center agents being monitored is assigned, wherein one of the multiple different customer queues is a queue for customers requiring an agent having a particular language skill," and "a visual alert configured to notify the manager of a lack of coverage of the particular language skill in the queue for customers requiring an agent having the particular language skill, the visual alert being configurable by a user to be displayed when specified conditions exist for the queue for customers requiring an agent having the particular language skill." The cited art also fails to teach or suggest a detailed area that displays "a list of each agent of the selected group of interaction center agents being monitored," and also "for each listed agent i) an indication that an agent has the particular language skill in connection with each of the listed agents that has the particular language skill, and ii) information specifying the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time."

While the four references cited as rendering claim 1 may disclose some aspects of claim 1, there is no disclosure or suggestion to provide a useful and efficient monitoring system as is provided in the combination of features set forth in Applicants' claim 1. In particular, the combined features of claim 1 provide benefits that are not disclosed or suggested by any of the references of record. For example, the presently claimed subject matter is particularly useful in the context of an international interaction center (for example, a call center) in which many different languages need to be supported, and in which various agents may have multiple different language capabilities. The use of the claimed "overview area" that provides configured alerts related to the lack of certain language resources for a particular queue, in combination with the use of the claimed "detailed area" for a manager to see the language skills of all of the available individual agents so as to make reassignments as needed is very useful.

Moreover, the providing of the group statistics that relate to the "overall responsiveness measure" of the group as a whole (in all queues) as set forth in claim 1 also helps in managing

the process of utilizing language skills in an interaction center environment, and in particular in determining whether or not the alerts as to a lack of a particular language skill in a particular queue, as configured by a user, are appropriate or not. Indeed, it may be the case that a reassignment of an agent with the appropriate language skill for the queue in question, although it may help the situation in that queue, may nevertheless lead to an overall deterioration in the responsiveness measure of the group as a whole being monitored. That may tell the manager that instead of making such a reassignment in the future of an agent with a particular language skill, a more appropriate course would be to change the user configuration of the conditions under which the alert is provided.

In addition, the design philosophy of the presently disclosed and claimed manager's graphical user interface is that "more is less." Indeed, in many cases of known interaction center software applications, a manager can easily get lost in the details that are provided. In the present case, by contrast, Applicants have described and claimed a novel and non-obvious combination of information displays in an overview area and a separate detailed area as described above, and this particular arrangement is designed in manner that enables a manager to see at a glance the relevant information needed to manage the interaction center operations effectively and efficiently. This particular claimed arrangement is neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record.

While Elsey in particular does indeed, as noted in the Office Action, disclose that agents may have different language skills [see para. 0116 of Elsey], that has little if any relation to what is presently claimed in Applicants' claim 1, as amended. In particular, Applicants' claim 1, as amended, requires that there be a queue for customers that require a particular language, that there be a configured alert that indicates a lack of the particular language skill in that queue, and that detailed information be provided about the language skills of agents such that reassignments may be easily made to respond to the alerted situation. There is no such disclosure or suggestion of these features in Elsey, or any other reference of record.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and that the obviousness rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 should be withdrawn. In addition, independent claims 8, 17 and 18 are patentable over the cited references at least for the

reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, as are dependent claims 9-15, and ask that the obviousness rejections of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Conclusion


Applicants submit that claims 1-6, 8-15, 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please charge deposit account 06-1050 in the amount of \$1,100 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2009



Stephen R. Schaefer
Reg. No. 37,927

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945